



FACULTY OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

WHO SEES WHAT?

Perceived learning areas after participating in an edularp

Josefin Westborg

Bachelor thesis:	15 credits
Programme/course:	PDGX61
Level:	Basic level
Term/year:	Autumn 2018
Supervisor:	Sverker Lundin
Examiner:	Marianne Strömberg
Report nr:	HT18 IPS PDGX61:1

Abstract

Bachelor thesis: 15 credits
Program and/or course: PDGX61
Level: Basic level
Semester/year: Autumn 2018
Supervisor: Sverker Lundin
Examiner: Marianne Strömberg
Report No: HT18 IPS PDGX61:1

Purpose: To find out if there is a difference in what is perceived about learning depending on your relation to edularp.

Theory: Hammer et al's (2018) model of educational features of role-playing. The model consists of five main features that each has a number of sub parts. The five main features are Portraying a character, Manipulation a fictional world, Altered sense of reality, Shared imagination, and Making RPGs. The feature Making RPGs is not used since it is not relevant for this study.

Method: Using a pre-existing quantitative survey and making qualitative interviews with edularp participants. The four interviewees have different relations to edularp. Two are student participants, one is a teacher and one is a designer. The data are analysed with Hammer et al's (2018) model to see what features each participant see and if they see anything that is not covered by the model.

Result: In the end there does not seem to be any clear differences in perceptions about learning from edularps regardless if you are a student, a teacher or a designer. What seems to affect most is more connected to how immersed you are in the larp rather than what relationship you have to it. There do seem to be a difference between what parts that were easy or hard to perceive. When applying Hammer et al's (2018) key features about learning through RPGs and edularps to the experience of participants we can see that some learning features in edularps are easier perceived than others. Two areas were found that after further research might be relevant to add to Hammer et al's (2018) model, Agency and Personal growth.

Foreword

I want to thank everybody that help me and supported me in making this thesis happen. I could never have done this without you.

Thank you to all the interviewees. For sharing your perspectives, insights and time.

Thank you to Staffan Björk for support and answering stupid questions and for asking even stupider questions back to make me think and provoke me. And for literary making one comment per sentence.

Thank you to my supervisor Sverker Olofsson for saying the words “Take it easy, it’s just a bachelor.”.

Thank you to Lobo Olsson for overall support, proof reading and help with software.

Thank you to the Knutpunkt community for widening my horizons and inspiring me to do more.

Table of content

Introduction	1
Theory	4
Research questions	6
Method	7
Data	9
Portraying a character.....	9
Perspective taking.....	9
Experience taking	10
Vicarious experience	10
Manipulating a fictional world.....	11
Theory crafting and experimentation	11
Authentic simulation	12
Situated motivational affordances	13
Altered sense of reality.....	13
Narrative immersion.....	13
Ethical thinking	14
Safe high pressure situations	14
Shared imagination.....	14
Social learning skills	15
Role-switching.....	15
Communities of practise.....	15
Overview matrix.....	16
Analysis.....	17
The participants	17
Findings related to Hammer et al's model	17
New parts.....	18
Problems with Edularps.....	19
The model.....	22
Limitations	23
Conclusions	24
Reference list.....	25

Introduction

As one of the co-founders of Lajvbyrån (2018), I work with what is commonly called edularps which is a portmanteau of Educational Larps. Larp, live-action role-playing, is a leisure activity that can be seen as a variety of more traditional tabletop roleplaying games. In both larps and tabletop role-playing games players improvise what actions the characters would do based on their goals and what is perceived as making an interesting story for the player. But in contrast to tabletop roleplaying games, in larps, players portray a character through physical embodiment. Or in other words:

“Larp is a form of game play in which participants physically embody characters within a fictional scenario for extended periods of time. Designers can set larps in any time, place, or genre. Characters range from strongly similar to the player’s primary identity to completely distinct” (Bowman 2010)

When larps are used as a method for learning they are called edularp. This is not to say that you cannot learn something from every larp, but whether a larp has been designed with a specific formal learning goal in the sense that it is intended to be used in an educational setting. An edularp can be about any subject, from history and language to chemistry or sex ed.

Not all edularps can be won even if they are called live-action role-playing games. The edularps in this thesis is closer to the Nordic larp (2018) style where you look at larps more as stories than as games. It is more relevant to create an interesting story than it is to try to win. While edularps, and larps in general, have many things in common with games they typically (at least in the Nordic tradition) do not have winning conditions so it is impossible to even say that you have won one after playing any more than you can be declared a winner after reading a book or watching a movie.

Edularps are one of many forms of role-playing based learning tools (see Bowman, p. 118, 2014 for related concepts such as game-based learning, psychodrama, and simulation). However, simulation merits mention here since that is important for understanding some of the answers in this thesis. While many types of simulations exist, Bowman refers to simulations that are a form of role-playing. Where larp is focused on a fictional world that is often different from the world we live in, simulations are often set in this world. The same goes for the aspect of time. Most larps are set in a different time while most simulations are connected to now or near now. However, an important distinction, maybe the main one, is the relationship to the character. In simulations you often play either yourself or a social role, like the manager or the doctor, while you in larps (and thereby in edularps) play a character. A character is not just about a social role or about where you are in a hierarchy, a character has ideas, goals and a way to view the world. It has dreams and a background story. This doesn’t mean that these attributes of the character are always shown or even acted upon or written down in the character but it is part of the concept. When playing a character the idea is that one is playing someone else, not just oneself in another social position. This is also stressed by Harviainen that states that larping is “[r]ole-playing in which a character, not just a social role, is played.” (2011, p. 176).

It should be noted that there are no hard boundaries between larps and simulations and sometimes they overlaps both on a design level and on a personal level. They are on the same spectra but are not the same. A lot of the time the words character and role are not used separately regarding either larps or simulation. They are mixed and used interchangeably in daily use. However, in this thesis they will be used separately with role meaning a social role and character something you play that is further removed from yourself. This to be able to discuss the two different concepts in a clear way.

The way we at Lajvbyrån work with running edularps is by doing a day or half a day where we come to visit and bring all that is needed such as props and costumes. The school or the municipality has chosen one of our edularps that is connected to a specific subject. The schools don’t have to do any preparation before the edularp more than making sure that at least one teacher per class will be participating. This

is for both legal reason (if something would happen they are responsible for the students and need to write a report about what happened) and so the teachers can use the experience after we have left to keep working with it to strengthen the learning experience. The day usually starts with what in larp terminology is called workshops. Larp workshops can have many purposes (e.g. letting players develop their characters and their relations or letting players familiarize themselves to sensitive subjects the larps will relate to) and can be very beneficial (Bruun, 2011; Harder, 2007; Heyward 2010; Hyltoft, 2012; Jansen, 2012). The workshops Lajvbyrån run serve the role to explain what larp is, to give the participants an idea about the world we will be larping in, to distribute characters, to give players methods for how to larp and portray characters, to get costumes, and overall be ready for the larp.

A debrief is usually held after the edularp has finished. This is a central part for achieving the pedagogical goals. (Aarebrot, Nielsen, 2012; Brummel, Cherif and Somervill, Gunsalus, Andresen & Louie, 2010; Harder, 2007; Henriksen, 2006; Heyward, 2010; Howes and Cruz, 2009; Hyltoft, 2012; Karalevich, 2012; Kettula, 2012; Martin, 2007; McSharry and Jones, 2000) The debrief Lajvbyrån runs consist of three parts. The first is to validate the participants' experience. This is done by talking about the experience to get it out of the system. It's about telling their story and hearing the others. It is hard to focus on something else after a strong experience so by talking about it and get to hear others it is easier to then refocus. The second part is to create a common understanding of what happened. This is about clearing up any misunderstandings that might have happened in the edularp both between players and about the content. Maybe voting was used but that is was rigged to make a certain point? Or maybe there was a certain level of artistic freedom taken about the historical accuracy? This is where you clear that up. The last part is about contextualization. About taking the learning experience and connecting it to the real world so it does not just stay within the context of the game. While doing this we make sure to connect back to the participants' experience to make it relevant for them. When we are done we always give the teachers material that can help them to keep working with this experience when we leave.

This thesis will be based on experiences of two specific edularps. They were made to be run in a class without preparations before that day. The target audience is players that are 13 or older. Both games are also written based on the Swedish curriculum Lgr 11 (Skolverket, 2011).

The first one is called Alfa/Omega. It's a larp about norm criticism in a science fiction setting. The fictional world of the edularp is a fascist society with a strict caste system where all people are seen to be either Alfas or Omegas. This is their tau, their caste. It's believed to be something biological that you are born with but it doesn't show until you are in your teens. As a form of rite of passage (or coming of age ceremony), all teens do a test to find out what their tau is. The edularp is about that test day. For more information about Alfa/Omega, see Westborg (2016). After the larps we discuss what norms are, what function they have, and how to detect them.

The second edularp is called For the Greater Good. It's an alternative history edularp about bravery and compassion and to be an ordinary person caught in a power struggle between two political sides. The world is set in a dictatorship Sweden that violates human rights and does not allow free speech. There is also a group of freedom fighters, or terrorist if you ask the government, that is called Snapphanar. Snapphanarna is run from Denmark and say that they want to help Sweden become a democratic country. The group finance their activities through illegal actions as smuggling drugs and weapons. Both sides use collective punishment to push their agenda. The edularp is about a group of people living in the same building that has been brought in by the military because the government wants to interrogate them. It's said that someone in the house has been hiding a leader from Snapphanarna. They are told that someone needs to sign a confession and that person will be sent to a labour camp. If no one signs all of them will go to prison for the rest of their life. The twist of the edularp is that there isn't any character that is guilty but someone will still need to sign. The players do not know that no one is guilty. After the edularp there are discussions about bravery and what that means, how you react in a pressured situation and how, when and if to act. The players are informed about the design choice that there was

no culprit and there is a discussion about if this could happen for real and where. A lot of the time we also discuss peer pressure, wanting to fit in and not stand out.

A thing I noticed when I talked to participants after the edularps is that what the students talked about what they learned and what the teachers talked about what the students learned was different. They seemed to have different perspectives. The teachers seemed to see more things and talk about it as more useful than the students. Is it so, that they see different things and are there some areas that are harder to see than others? This is what I decided to look closer at.

This thesis is relevant for anyone who works with or wants to work with edularps a tool, both for knowing what you might want to highlight in the learning aspect when running edularps but also for knowing in which context it can be suitable or not to use edularps. It also shows some problems with working with edularps that is good to watch out for. It is also relevant for scholar and designers that might want to use Hammer et al.'s model to investigate edularps.

Theory

When looking at studies of live action role-playing experiences that include data collection and has a focus on the participants, one can find two different approaches. The first focuses on open-ended questions, e.g. Cheng (2008), Guenther and Moore, (2005) and Howes and Cruz (2009). They all look at how participants at university or graduate level perceive the content and what specific experiences they had. Cheng (2008), for instance, looked closer at learning language skills. None of these studies focuses on edularps as a pedagogical tool in itself or how participants perceive it. The other approach is to use a quantitative and qualitative mixed method design (Bowman, 2017). Here we have Brummel, Gunsalus, Andresen and Louie, (2010) that looked at a college class but we also find studies made on secondary education by Mochocki (2014) and Bowman and Standiford (2015). The studies made on secondary education were very different compared to each other. Mochocki (2014) did an observational study and then a grade comparison on several different larps. The observations focused on problems with the edularps seen by the organisers of the edularps. Mochocki (2014) concluded that most of the participant seemed to enjoy edularps and that the grades were comparable or better than traditional revision classes. Bowman and Standiford (2015) looked at learning through five hypothesized areas: perceived competence/self efficacy, intrinsic motivation, behavioural engagement, emotional engagement, cognitive engagement, leadership, and teamwork. The data revealed an increase in overall intrinsic motivation, interest/ enjoyment of science, and perceived competence. Brummel et al (2010) looked at nine role-play scenarios about responsible conduct of research. In their surveys, students reported that the role-plays were more engaging and promoted deeper understanding than a lecture or case study covering the same topic.

All of the studies mentioned have looked at their data and draw conclusions from that. To analyze the data it can be a good idea to use a relevant model and apply it to the data. In this case a model for learning that is applicable to the specific way that edularps are used. None of these studies mentioned seems to have taken that approach. This is probably because there have not existed such a model connected to analyze edularps before. The closest we see to this is Bowman and Standiford (2015) and their hypothesized areas. Now such a model exists. In *Learning and Role-playing games* (2018) Hammer, To, Schrier, Bowman and Kaufman look at the educational features of role-playing games and larps. They specify two applications for their model.

First, it allows us to use these features analytically to understand how and why educational RPGs affect players. Not only can this help us scholars, it can also help teachers and learners select role-play activities that align with their educational goals. Second, we can use our understanding of these features to enhance future educational RPGs, including both designing games to be used in educational settings and redesigning educational interventions to take advantage of key features of RPGs.

Hammer et al. (2018)

It is made not only to help you think but to actually be put in use. In the model they identify five key features that in turn has subcategories that I will call parts. The five main features are Portraying a character, Manipulation a fictional world, Altered sense of reality, Shared imagination, and Making RPGs.

When looking at critiques against edularps and role-playing games there are four main areas being brought up. The first is about how some students have difficulties with playing a character. (Mochocki, 2013) The second is about that edularps are not very good at teaching facts but rather should be used when you want to internalize skills, knowledge, and competencies. (Harder, 2007; Henriksen, 2006; Porter, 2008; Hyltoft, 2010) Mochocki (2013) believes that edularp should serve only as a revision of subject matter rather than exposing students to new material. The third area is about ending up with more focus on “fun”, than on learning. (Henriksen, 2006; Harder, 2007) The last area brought up is the

negative effect if you do not do enough preparations (for example with workshops) or skip debrief. (Aarebrot and Nielsen, 2012; McDonald and Kreizenbeck, 2012) I will investigate if these areas of critique are something that I will find support for and if there are other areas that are not covered by the literature that can be seen.

Research questions

Edularps are tools for learning. After participating in an edularp there seemed to be very different views by students and teachers about what they learned. When I started to look into this I could not find studies that looked closer at this gap in perception. This made want to find out more about it. Therefore, this study will look into and try to answer these questions:

What do people that have played edularps perceive that they have learned?

Is there a difference in what they have perceived?

If it is a difference, where does it come from?

Do they perceive any problems with edularp as a tool for learning?

Method

To get answers to the research questions I categorize the possible aspects of learning in edularp to be able to see differences more clearly. To support me in this process I will use Hammer et al's (2018) model that looks at different learning features in roleplaying games and edularps. This model is made for many different kinds of educational role-playing games and different uses of them. This allows it to cover a lot but it also makes it a bit straggly. Even though it is a bit wide it is a tool that is made to help with understanding how edularps can affect the player. Because of the model's width, some parts of it will not be relevant for my work. I will exclude the last of the five features, Making RPGs, since I will be looking at perceptions of participating/running an edularp and not about making your own. Since it is a fairly new model that means it might have some weaknesses or even miss some things completely. Because of this, I decided to use the model not while gathering my data but only when analyzing it. By doing this I will also see if there are any areas missing in the model compared to my data and evaluate the model while using it.

To gather data I decided to use both a survey and interviews with previous participants of edularp. The survey to get the width, to see if there were some learning areas that stood out and use as a base for doing deeper interviews. The interviews to get not only student perspectives but also teachers and designers. I also wanted to see if students saw different thing depending on how much time had passed since they participated in the edularp.

The surveys I got access to through my job as a larp pedagog. The surveys we do are made to evaluate the edularps we run. Through these surveys we get an idea of what the students thought about the edularp and what they have learned. The survey used in this thesis consists of answers from 240 students from six different runs of the larp Alfa/Omega. They were from five different schools in the same municipality. All were in secondary education in their eighth year of school and between 14 and 15 years old. After the larp was done they got to answer a survey with questions about what they thought about the larp. The survey had both checkbox answers and open answers. Since the survey wasn't made specifically for the purpose of this thesis it sometimes doesn't have answers to my research questions. For all the questions in the survey see Appendix 1.

Some of the answers were more extensive but some were short and more silly and probably just made to be funny. An example of one of the silly answers to the question "Tell us about something you will remember" was "orange, apple"¹. Because of this the answers in the survey felt a bit thin and it also just had the viewpoint of someone who had just played an edularp but had not had any time to process it. To get a deeper knowledge I wanted to be able to ask follow-up questions and I wanted to get different perspectives. To do this I decided to make interviews with people that had different relations to edularps. The first is a participant that recently played the edularp "For the greater good". This is a different larp than was played by the students in the survey but the themes of the larps are closely connected. This participant goes to the university and played the larp as part of hirs² education about games. This person will hereafter be called the "Recent participant". The second is a larp participant that also played "For the greater good" but did it half a year ago and therefore have had some time to process the experience. This participant is studying to become a teacher and played the edularp as part of an extracurricular activity. This person will hereafter be called the "Long time participant". The third is a teacher that took part in the edularp "Alfa/Omega". This was one of the runs when we made the surveys that are used here. This person will hereafter be called the "Teacher". The last one is a designer and producer of edularps that has a background as a theatre teacher. Ze also regularly run both the edularps mentioned

¹ All translations of quotes by participants are made by me.

² Ze is a personal pronoun that is gender neutral. It will be used throughout the thesis to anonymize the respondents. It is used as follows. He/She/Ze is laughing. I called him/her/hir. His/Her/Hir eyes gleam. That is his/hers/hirs. He/She/Ze likes himself/herself/hirself.

in this thesis, “For the greater good” and “Alfa/Omega”. This person will hereafter be called the “Designer/producer”.

The survey do have something to add with its width so I decided to use them as a starting point for the interviews as well. This also helped since using Hammer et al's (2018)s model as the starting point could influence the answers in the interview to fit the model and through that miss important parts instead of making the interviewed talk more freely around the subject. I went through the surveys looking for themes in the answers. These themes would be the starting point for the interview questions. Three themes stood out clearly:

The first was about agency and empowerment.

The second was about perspective.

The third was about the subject of the larp.

The interview questions (Appendix 2) were then based around these three different themes. All the interviews started with asking about their relation to edularps and what they remember from the run they were part of. Then the interview questions from the areas that came up in the survey were introduced and from there the conversation went a bit more freely around the subject of edularps and learning. The interviews were recorded to be able to go through them after and also collect quotes. All interviewees have had the chance to read and approve to the quotes.

When the data is collected, Hammer et al's (2018) model will be applied to see what parts are perceived by whom. It will be applied to all the interviews but also to the answers in the survey. Even if the survey itself is thin it is interesting to see if the parts in the model can be seen there too. It is interesting since the participants in the survey were quite a lot younger than the participants in the interviews. Since the survey is the combined answers of 240 students it will not be comparable to the interviews one to one but it will give an indication if the learning parts were perceived by any of the students.

Data

The data will be presented according to the learning features in the model by Hammer et al (2018). Each learning feature and their different parts are gone through and applied to the answers in the survey and the interviews. In the end, there is a matrix to see what learning feature was mentioned by whom. Both the interviews and the survey were made in Swedish. All translations are made by me. That means that I will sometimes change the Swedish word for role to character when translating to follow the structure of the words meaning as defined in the introduction and as I interpret the meaning in the answer. I present one to two quotes from each interviewee and three examples from the survey for each part.

Portraying a character

Portraying a character is split into three parts; Perspective taking, Experience-taking and Vicarious Experience. This is the learning feature that was the most obvious one for all the interviewed. All of them mentioned Portraying a character and had thoughts about it. We can also see it in the survey.

Perspective taking

The first part of Portraying a character is about perspective taking. It's about imagining the experience of others. It was mentioned in all the interviews and we can see it in the answers in the survey. In the survey we see it mentioned:

(I have learned) to see things from someone else's point of view and perspective.

(I have learned) more about how it feels to have parents that deviate from the norm.

I have got a new way to look at things.

In the interviews we hear the Recent participant talk about it:

Some things felt like... this is wrong, this is not something my character would have said... or done... and then I abstained from it. (...) I did many more things and said other things that I as a person wouldn't have said.

Here we can see a clear reflection over how the character is seen as someone different from oneself and that taking the perspective of the character is something that is actively done. Later the Recent participant also thinks about this:

It's hard to say a lot about it since I've only done it once, but I can imagine that if you keep doing this, if you have many different larps and play many different characters, you can probably get many different perspectives on other people and perspectives on society and the world and different thoughts. At least if you allow yourself.

It was also mentioned by the Long time participant. Then in connection to that schools also do this in other ways for example when training for debates:

You get to see it from another person perspective and how the other person perceives it. Get an understanding for each other and differences and so.

The teacher said that:

I think that is... in some ways maybe it is the only way to really learn perspective-taking. To theorize around it, to talk about seeing the others way to understand the world, you can do that but it stops on some theoretical level. You can understand other people's perspective in a theoretical way without really understanding it deep

down I think. I think that role-playing or other experience-based methods are the only way to do it for real.

The designer/producer said:

Then you can see that they [the participants] are forced to think it over one more time since they in their character has gotten described exactly how... not exactly.. but at least mainly how they [the characters] are thinking in these questions. So there you can see how they start to reason, first from their character.. Like... "My character doesn't like alfas so then they [the character] should think that these jobs should fit best for omegas." So they start to think from these different paths in another way then if they would just get the question straight on.

Experience taking

The second part of portraying a character is Experience Taking. By imagining and really going into your character and the game, being immersed into it, you can feel and experience things that you would not do normally and have it feel like it is happening to you. It was mentioned in all interviews except for the Recent participant. We also see this mentioned in the surveys even if it is not one of the main themes. Here are some examples from the survey:

[My character did things I wouldn't normally do] They were sure that they fit in.

[I'm going to remember] That the emotions felt pretty real...

[I'm going to remember] How disappointed I was when I became an Omega.

In the interviews the Long time participant mentioned this:

I think we all experienced, at least the majority of us from what I remember what we talked about after, that it really, like this, you really got that feeling. It like really felt like we were sitting in there and that it really was like "I'm going to shoot one of you if" .. if.. well.. you got... it's like really for real. Even.. You really went into it even if you weren't that good at acting.

The teacher talked about it:

The expectations (before the larp) were that, most of all, that the students physically should get an experience and learn something through going into a character and experience something that is... yes, outside of the ordinary situation in school.

The teacher later commented that this expectation was met. The designer/producer said when talking about it:

There you can see that larp has a great strength. Like... you can put up a camp without anything that is from our time really. And make it really cool. And make them understand... and connected this also to... for example the experience that there are no electricity so when it gets dark it's really dark and that is something a lot of kids today have no experience of.

Vicarious experience

The third part of Portraying a character is Vicarious Experience. It is about when you have an experience in the larp that probably isn't going to happen to them in their ordinary life but that they can still learn from. This is a theme that is hard to find in the surveys but was mentioned by all except the Teacher in the interviews. The Recent participant said this when talking about other countries:

Now I don't know exactly how they, they are thinking there. But if I was to think as my character it felt like a normal thing when I was my character. That this was what society looked liked and that was normal. Ehh... And then I've been thinking that even if I in Sweden as me me thinks that: Oh God, how can this happen?... so I can still understand how humans in those countries don't react in the same way.

and also after having talked about peer pressure and how that showed in the larp:

I have not been thinking back so much on the situation [the larp], I've been thinking more forward.. Ehhh... not so much my own everyday life. Ehh... I've been thinking a bit about when Hitler came to power and how everyone just went with the flow. Since that is pretty relevant at the time being.

The Long time participant mentioned this:

Like I felt then(at the larp). It really felt like as if one was sitting in the cell, and shit, I've never experienced that someone held a weapon like... so... It happened that... to just get to feel that emotion because then later you might get an understanding for the people who is in that situation. So it's something I can have both for the future and for here and now.

and also had a reflection about it:

Yes, well, there was a lot of thoughts that came up after the larp, directly after the larp, thinking that like this is how it really is.. It's not impossible that is something that happens in other countries. Maybe not in Sweden, or... yes but, not in Sweden because.. because then it isn't like that. But in other countries I absolutely think it can be a fact that it is like that...

The teacher didn't mention this. The Designer/producer took an example connected to edularps about history:

Like our larps about the stone age, the bronze age and the iron age makes them comprehend a bit about that some things really didn't exist. That it became a "Oh right, telephones didn't exist". When we start asking questions "what do you mean write?" or "Now I don't really understand"... That... that they get an understanding in a totally different way about history. That it doesn't contain that you had a telephone.

later the Designer/producer continues:

You can make them understand these things in a more practical way. So it becomes an "Aha!".

Manipulating a fictional world

Manipulating a fictional world is split into three different parts; Theorycrafting and Experimentation, Authentic Simulation and Situated Motivational Affordances. This learning feature is more uneven when it comes to what parts the participants perceived.

Theory crafting and experimentation

Theorycrafting and experimentation are about constructing theories and then testing them against the domain. It's about trying things out to reach in-game goals. It could be coming up with a plan for how to make sure that during the negotiations no one will trade with your enemy for example. It was

mentioned in the surveys and by all interviews except for the Long time participant. In the free text areas in the survey we only see it mentioned by one student that writes:

I had wished for your personal choices to have a bigger impact because I worked very hard to fit the description [of the character].

So even if the player did not feel that it had a great impact they did have a theory they tested. When the students were asked to say how much they think they could affect the larp 180 out of 239 gave it a 3 (a bit) or more on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 5 (a lot). In the interviews the Recent participant mentioned:

Oh great, then I can be the one that brings the group together. But then once when we started it was a lot like “You did it, You did it”, “But hello what about you?”.. Yeah, like that. And then you don’t, because we were pretty many, you don’t, or I don’t, want to stand out.

So ze could test to take one role in the group and then when it didn’t work ze changed the plan. The Long time participant didn’t mention this part in the interviews. The teacher said:

“That they have during an hour.. or it was even a full day, been trying to find a lot of strategies and tried to understand this system...”

where the system is the game world. The designer/producer talked about it in connection to the story arc:

The story arc is also a part of.. Ehhh.. well, that you have experienced that everyone might have been participating. And, like this “Well, so then you did this and that made this happened.” And there we have the dynamic in this story arc. Larp has more... you can effect the story arc that exists through acting in different ways.

Authentic simulation

Authentic Simulation is about practising real-world skills. This is often seen in simulations where you participate as yourself and not as a character. It’s important that the focus is on authenticity and not on realism. A basic example could be a fire drill where you practice going to the right meet up area. You can also apply it to help players understand the behaviour of the game world as a complex system. It could be in an edularp playing a historical character learning about a historical situation that took many years but in the role-playing game you might play it out in a much shorter time. In the survey and interviews, we can see the part about understanding a complex system, while the focus on real-world skills is not as present. In the surveys we can see a few mentions about the complex system of norms that the larp was about:

I have learned how it can be to example live in a country with racism or inequality.

[I have learned] more about norms and their influence.

[I have learned] To see the norms in society.

You can see one of the main areas of answers to be about this part since a lot of the students wrote about norms in their answers because that was the theme of the larp. But most of the answers do not show if they have learned about the system or just facts so it’s quite a stretch to try to put them in here. In the interviews the only one that clearly mentioned this part was the designer/producer when talking about when it’s good to have a clear character:

In historical processes where it’s important that you take a stance.

Situated motivational affordances

Situated Motivational Affordances is when the game gives a reason to engage in learning behaviours. As it's described by Hammer et al's (2018) it's about when the game makes you want to learn more about something in relation to the game. For example, if you are going to play a historical character in a larp you might become curious and read more about the character than you needed for the larp. This is not something that is mentioned in the surveys and the only person saying something about it in the interviews are the Long time participant that said:

Maybe they get to do some research about it first. To get some facts and somewhere to start from. They get.. "Now you're going to be Carl XI blah blah blah and now you are going to find out some information about him."

Altered sense of reality

Altered sense of reality is split into three different parts; Narrative Immersion, Ethical thinking and Safe High Pressure Situations. This feature was mentioned by all of the interviewees and in the surveys except for the part about High Pressure situations that was not mentioned at all.

Narrative immersion

Narrative immersion is about that when you immerse into a story there is a potential for altering your schemas and pre-existing representations. This is not something that was mentioned in any of the surveys or the interviews since it is something that you need to know about to consider. In a wider stance I would interpret this part of the model so that any mentioning about being immersed goes into this. That puts it closely connected to the Experience taking that is part of Portraying a Character. I'm going to take that stance here and then we can see it mentioned both in the surveys and in the interviews. In the survey we see some examples:

[I'm going to remember] The immersion

I have learned to be swept away by a character, was surprised that I actually became disappointed over becoming an omega.

[I'm going to remember] how well some was immersed in their characters.

It was mentioned in the interviews by all except for the Recent participant. The Long time participant mentioned this:

Like I felt then[at the larp]. It really felt like as if one was sitting in the cell, and shit, I've never experienced that someone held a weapon like... soo.. It happened that... to just get to feel that emotion because then later you might get an understand for the people who are in that situation.

The Teacher said:

Since some really took the opportunity and immersed into their character and expand their role[within the group] it affected the smaller groups that they were a part off.

The Designer/Producer only mentioned it connected to a discussion about making your own character compared to have a prewritten character and then in the context that it's something you actually can't see.

You can't see on someone how much they are thinking about that your mother is a muggle or that my mom is Alfa or Omega.

Ethical thinking

The second part is Ethical thinking and is about making value judgements and addressing critical complex social situations. This was mentioned all the interviewees and is one of the main areas in the survey. Here are some answers from the survey:

I can detect more injustices.

I have more opinions about equality now

[I'm going to remember] that it's important to stand up for your opinions.

The recent participant said:

I might have followed the peer pressure. But I felt that my character didn't want that.

and also had a reflection about what it would have looked like in the real world:

The smartest thing for me if this was a real situation would have been to be quiet and just agree.

The Long Time Participant said this when talking about their thoughts during the larp when the group were trying to find a culprit.

But what the hell, can't someone just confess? It's not me!

The Teacher talked about that during the after discussion some participant reacted strongly to the fact that somethings in the larp were pre-decided and that the participant didn't find that out until after the larp.

They need to understand that what you are, are not something you have chosen. Then you can have a class perspective on this also and then things become different. But I think it was so.... ehhhh.. such an effective way... the surprise effect as such is valuable because it needs to grab hold of them emotionally also. Like this surprise effect did. But I also understand the idea that you could have a discussion about the roles you have in your life. What in that do you choose and what don't you?

The Designer/Producer said when talking about getting an alibi from your character:

To have this alibi and just keep going.. "Yeah, I'm an Alfa and I'm always prejudiced towards all Omegas", that is to really take an alibi.... and being kind of a douchebag. And that is something they reflect over themselves a lot of the time. "I was one of those really racist against all Omegas" or so..

Safe high pressure situations

The third part is Safe high pressure situations. That is when you for example prepare for a crisis situation. About being in a situation with a lot of stress and high stakes but just within the fictional world. This is often done as simulations where you don't play a character and are yourself. It is not mentioned by any of the interviewees or in the survey.

Shared imagination

Shared imagination is split into three parts, Social Learning Skills, Role-switching and Communities of Practice. Communities of Practice was hardly seen at all in the interviews. The Producer/Designer mentioned the Social Learning Skills and only the Teacher mentioned Role-Switching. But otherwise it was not mentioned at all. In the survey both Social Learning Skills can be seen.

Social learning skills

Social learning skills are about learning to interact with others. It is about working in groups and understand how other people think and feel. It is mentioned in the survey but in the interviews, it is only mentioned by the designer/producer.

We see it mentioned by some in the survey:

[I have learned] that it's not super scary to be around and hang out with people I normally don't talk to.

...I have started to view people in a new way.

[I have learned] to express emotions and opinions more.

The Producer/Designer said:

You can see how people "Oh, so you reacted in this way on that. I didn't expect that."... "I didn't expect for that person to react in this way" or "If I said so then this happened!". That is so very good at a larp.

Role-switching

Role-Switching is about social roles for the players not about characters. About who you are in the group. This is not mentioned in the surveys in any explicit way. We have answers about that as a character they were more confident, talked more or was shy and quiet but that doesn't really say if they have taken a new role within the group. It could mean that, but it doesn't have too.

The only one that mentioned role-switching in the interviews was the teacher.

I did also see that there were some students that had problems with taking on a role... that in their everyday life already are working a lot with their role.

Later in the interview we had a conversation that led to me asking a specific question about role switching and if it was something that had come up after they played the larp.

*No, I wouldn't say that I saw that. When we played we were in a mixed group with students from two different classes. And that in itself gave some interesting dynamics since it was two classes with... very different, different class cultures so to say. Well, maybe in one of the classes. *silence* Maybe in that group that was... that I see as it's having a bit more rigid roles. That they.. That it happened something there with the ones that were a bit more modest there... that they could find a voice in the classroom after.*

Communities of practise

Communities of Practise as it is used by Hammer et al (2018) is about social norms and what kind of contributions to the game that is acceptable. Those become acceptable contributions to the discipline, and group participants can learn about those norms by participating in the game.

From this perspective all the interviewees and a large part of the answers in the survey mention it because they talk about that they have learned how to larp. But since we are looking at edularps where we have specific learning goals, that usually are something else than just learning to larp, we want these disciplines to align with academic learning areas. No such thing was mentioned by any of the interviewees nor in the survey.

Overview matrix

Here is a matrix to see what parts were answered by whom. Each one of the educational features parts is presented on a row each. The features names have been shorted.

PaC - Portraying a Character

MaFW - Manipulating a Fictional World

ASoR - Altered Sense of Reality

SI - Shared Imagination

	Survey	Recent participant	Long time participant	Teacher	Designer/ Producer
PaC - Perspective taking	x	x	x	x	x
PaC - Experience taking	x	-	x	x	x
PaC - Vicarious experience	-	x	x	-	x
MaFW - Theorycrafting and experimentation	x	x	-	x	x
MaFW - Authentic simulation	x	-	-	-	x
MaFW - Situated motivational affordances	-	-	x	-	-
ASoR - Narrative immersion	x	-	x	x	x
ASoR - Ethical thinking	x	x	x	x	x
ASoR - Safe high-pressure situations	-	-	-	-	-
SI - Social learning skills	x	-	-	-	x
SI - Role-switching	-	-	-	x	-
SI - Communities of practice	-	-	-	-	-

Analysis

When using quotes in this part I will use quotes that most clearly show what is discussed. This means that if something was mentioned many times or by different people I will prioritise the answers that highlight the subject most clearly. When discussing parts I will keep to the same arrangement as in the Data section.

The participants

Findings related to Hammer et al's model

At first it seems like there is a difference in what parts the participants perceive. Or at least a difference concerning what seems clear and apparent. It is important to keep in mind that if a respondent does not mention a certain aspect, this does not have to mean that they can not perceive it. But since it was not brought up it is not as obvious. There are different reasons for this. Some parts of the model were not mentioned might be because they are closer to other types of role-playing experiences like simulation. Here we can see Safe high-pressure situations and Authentic simulation. We can see that the design might have an effect. The part Ethical thinking in the feature Altered sense of reality is perceived by everyone. And this is probably because the larps was about ethics. The design and the arrangement of the day might also affect the other way around. We can see this in Communities of Practice and Situated Motivational Affordances. For Communities of Practice the larps were not designed to align the behaviours in the larps with behaviours out of the larp but rather focused on creating tension and drama. Situated Motivational Affordances is highly dependent on being able to prepare for the larp and this was not made possible here.

In total the Designer/Producer mentioned 8 of 12 parts, the Teacher 6 of 12 parts, the Long time participant 6 of 12 parts, the Recent participant 4 out of 12 parts and in the survey we can see 7 out of 12 parts.

The Designer/Producer cover the most parts of the different participants, 8 out of 12. This might not be surprising as this is hir area of expertise. But the fact that you are a larp designer does not mean that you can relate to, know about or perceive all learning aspects even if you work with larps with focus on education. The designer in the interview also has a background as a theater teacher and therefore has experience also within the field of education and this might have affected what hir perceived. The parts not mentioned by hir was the parts that connected more to simulation. Since ze is an expert in the field it is not surprising that ze separates between edularps and simulations and therefore does not mention it in an interview about edularps.

Authentic Simulations in the learning feature Manipulation a Fictional world is only mentioned by the Designer/producer among the interviewees, and in the survey. It is mentioned by the Designer/producer when talking about a historical edularp connected to getting an authentic experience. Since the larp "For the greater good" works less with focus on the world as a system and more on the personal level that is probably why it is not mentioned by the Recent participant and the Long time participant. They instead had a vicarious experience that is more on a personal level that was not had by the participants of "Alfa/Omega".

Covering the second most parts is the survey with 7 out of 12. That the survey covers many parts probably has to do with what was mentioned before, that there are so many answers made into one voice. You do not see all 240 evaluations mentioning all parts. What is interesting is that Vicarious experience can not be seen at all in the survey and it was not mentioned by the Teacher. This might have to do with that the larp they played, "Alfa/Omega", is a larp about norms with the main focus on gender norms. Being treated differently depending on norms are something they can relate to. It is something that happens to them in real life in contrast to the other larp, "For the greater good", where the participants were put in a situation that did not feel as it would happen to them here in Sweden. On the other hand

“Alfa/Omega” is a science fiction larp where they are sorted on how they have done on tests that are supposed to say something about their character's personality. This is not something you see every day, but since they are in a school context where you do tests and get sorted by grades, it might still feel like something real. The debrief can also help with the connection so that it felt more realistic. But in the end it might be that they did not experience it all.

The Teacher and the Long time participant both perceive 6 out of 12 parts. That is two more parts than the Recent participant. This could be connected to having a background in education since the Long time participant is studying to become a teacher. The Teacher and the Longtime participant do however not perceive the same parts. The ones they have in common is Perspective taking, Experience taking, Narrative immersion, and Ethical thinking. Situated motivation affordances were only perceived by the Long time participant. Since it is about preparing before the larp it is not surprising that is not seen by many of them but one could expect it to be a part that was mentioned by the Teacher. The Long time participant might have this perspective close since ze is in the process of preparing for becoming a teacher and thinking about different methods and tools to use in hir own practice. That the Teacher did not mention it might have to do with that ze does not see hirself using edularp as a tool but more think of it as something that is done by someone on the outside.

The Long time participant was the only participant that mentioned Situated motivational affordances, a part of the learning feature Manipulating a fictional world. This part is highly dependent on being able to prepare for the larp. Since this is not how these larps were run this is not an experience they had. It was still mentioned by the Long time participant but then when talking about how edularp could be used if it was used by a teacher and not by someone external that comes in to just run the edularp.

The teacher was the only participant that perceived Role-Switching and then that it did not happen in one class and maybe in the other. This might have to do with that to see a change in a group you need to know the group and it can be hard to see it when you are a part of it. That would mean only the teacher could have a chance to see this.

The Recent participant mentions only 4 out of 12 parts. She is the only one in the interviews that has no background within education and clearly mentions fewer parts than the others. The recent participant talked more from an outside perspective thinking about the character during the edularp compared to the other answers. Ze didn't seem to have been as immersed. We can see this in that Experience taking was mentioned by everyone except the recent participant. This connection, between experience taking and immersion, is also mentioned by Hammer et al (2018, page 290). This is probably also the reason that Narrative immersion is seen by everyone except the Recent participant.

What we can conclude is that in the end there is not that much of a difference between what parts of the model that are seen by whom except for immersion. The Designer/producer sees two areas more than the Teacher and the Long time participant. One of those areas was connected to simulations and not in the edularps that the Teacher and the Long time Participant took part in. The Recent participant seemed to perceive only four of the parts. The two parts that ze did not see that was mentioned by all the other was connected to immersion.

New parts

An interesting part with the answers is that I found areas that are hard to fit in any of the categories in the model by Hammer et al (2018) or in the other studies done in the field (see Theory). There was one very clear area that was mentioned by all except for the Longtime participant, and also the one thing that stood out the most in the survey. That is Agency and empowerment. How the participants in the larp did things they usually would not do. It is about the character giving an alibi to try out new things. In the survey, more than half of those who answered the question about if they did something they wouldn't normally do gave concrete examples of how they did this. Here are some examples from the survey:

My character was a rebel and dared to stand up against the leaders/norms/rules. This is something I myself probably wouldn't do.

Was very confident, had a straight back. Was like a royalty.

Was more extrovert, determined and confident than I would have been.

This was also mentioned by the Recent participant when talking about character:

I felt that I got permission to do more things Me as me wouldn't have said that. I might have been quiet or followed the peer pressure but my character didn't want to follow the peer pressure.

The Teacher said:

Students that in classroom situations are pretty timid can when they are in a role-playing situation, can take a step forward and become something more. Or maybe not become something more, but do something more. Because there is a space for that.

The Long time participant did not mention it. The Designer/producer said:

The alibi can be that they actually think that to be caring is something good and now I'm allowed to think so if I [my character] think Omegas are good.

This could be seen as something close to Experience-Taking but it's not just about doing what your character should do. A lot of the things mentioned in the examples here is not something that was written into the characters for the players. It's something they put in there themselves. I would call this area Agency. And suggest it as a new part to the educational feature Portraying a character since it is clearly connected to character and how the character gives an alibi to do things they usually would not do.

The perceived experience of doing new things is something that seems to not just stay with the character and leads us to the next area. This did not show clearly in the interviews, but in the survey we see numerous mentions that the students perceive they have changed on a personal level. Here are some examples from the survey:

I have become more confident.

I dare to speak more and louder.

... and to stand up for what I believe in.

This gives us an area that is close to the part Vicarious Experience, where you can relate to what you experienced and apply it to other things or construct new meanings, but here we see it as personal growth. It is not about applying it to other thing but about that they perceive they have been changed themselves. I would call this area Personal growth and suggest it to be added to the educational feature Altered sense of reality.

These are important parts of the learning experience that I see could add to Hammer et al's (2018) model. I would suggest this to be looked into more to see if this learning actually happens and then possibly add the two new parts.

Problems with Edularps

We can see the same pattern here as in what positive parts they perceived. The Designer/producer mentioned most, then the Teacher, then the Long time participant and last the Recent participant. Some

of the things mentioned by the Designer/producer but not anyone else was that it takes a lot of time and that some student might feel that they are doing something wrong when getting a prewritten character. The Long time participant also mentions that it probably is bad for learning facts like specific years but good for getting insights. The survey is not as relevant since it does not ask about problems. The closest thing we can see is that some thought it was boring, 12% gave it 1 or 2 out of 5.

The things that were mentioned in all the interviews as problematic and hard is connected to two different areas. The first area that is clearly brought up in the interviews is about having troubles with distancing yourself from your character. That not everyone is used to playing a character and that it is hard to do. We see this mentioned on many levels. From the more basic ones, like this said by the Recent participant:

Sometimes it was a bit difficult. I mean I as a person can have ideas and thoughts that is the total opposite of the character, at least what they start with. And then it's like... I had to work with [the character] gradually possibly open up for what I think. But that I still should follow my character and how it in a stressful situation might change. So it was very positive but also difficult.

To the more complicated ones here illustrated by the Teacher:

But I did also see that there were some students that had trouble with playing a character. That in their ordinary day life is already working a lot with their role towards other people I think. And then.. Then.. to step into something. There was one student that was a bit attacked by one of the leaders. The leader character. That couldn't separate the character the leader was playing and real life. That got really pissed over being sorted as an Omega when he or she had expected to become an Alfa. And thought it was personal. Or experienced it as a personal insult even if it wasn't. And.. I'm thinking that it is specifically... As I understand it, that it is students that in their everyday life have enough to deal with when it comes to their role. And that maybe never have trained their imagination. What it means.. Like.. To play pretend... You're thinking that playing pretend is something every child does at one point or another when growing up but not every child has that experience. They have never turned a chair upside down and made it into a ship or something like that. And then this becomes... They have nothing to relate it to. That this thing are just pretend. And then.. Then it is me [the student] personally that it is about. That's how I experienced that.

This is also a reason why it is so important with debrief. If no debrief is done you have a high risk of ending up with participants feeling very uncomfortable and attacked, especially when working with sensitive subjects. It is extra problematic when it is done as part of formal education where presence is mandatory. We see this illustrated by the Teacher when asked if problems with differentiating were something the students brought with them out of the game. Then she said:

Not this with playing a character. Because I think you did a great job with debriefing, with peeling of the layers, leaving your character and.. and really secure the understanding that this just was... Or I shouldn't say just. That is was a about stepping into a character. I felt that all students could walk away from there and really understand that that is what it was. Even if some of them were really upset during the experience, I really think you managed to pull it off so that everyone could leave and not bring it with them.

The second area mentioned in all the interviews is that if the game and the character is not designed in a good way it might make you feel implicitly accused, especially when it is about sensitive subjects like bullying. The Long time participant said this:

I'm thinking about for example fights. There we can stage a situation if we have seen a fight for example. It can be that you at the gathering talks about it and "Do you want to try to be the mean one? Do you want to be the nice one? "Do you want to be the one that got sad?" "Do you want to be the one that hit?" it can be that you... like going into a character. And there it can really be... there they can appreciate both sides. But it can't be like I said before, that it is the one that was behaving bad that should be the one who is nice and the other way around so it gets very clear. Because then I think it's negative. You should not exploit situations from real life in a larp... I don't think.

This can be seen both as a design and an implementation problem. With a poor design you end up imposing the subject instead of letting them explore it on their own. And if you implement it in a way where you use scenarios that is about a real-life situation that the participants were part of but do not address it, it will be seen as dishonest. Then the trust is broken and working with sensitive subjects without trust will not get you very far. You might end up making the situation worse. Since you also do it in front of the group you really put the involved persons on the spot in a way that can make them feel very unsafe. This is something all the participants are aware of since this they all mentioned it. This puts a lot of responsibility on those that are designing and/or running the edularp. When talking about designing the Designer/Producer said:

When it comes to norms it is really important as a designer to think about what perspective change you want them to experience and to do that before [as part of the design process].

This can be seen as a form of manipulation. When we consider the strong reactions some students had when having problems separating character and self that planned manipulation can be even more problematic. If the students get so emotionally affected this might be an experience that stays with them and that strongly affects them. And since the participants are not part of the design process and do not know what is going to happen this can be seen as a democratic problem. On the other hand the students do get informed that they can break the game and talk to the organizers at any time. There is also the debrief to give them a chance to talk about and deal with the experience. And yes, it can be seen as problematic that you enforce a certain viewpoint on them when it comes to norms, but that is also something that is mentioned in the curriculum Lgr 11 (Skolverket, 2011). In the part about Norms and values it says that:

The school shall actively and purposeful influence and stimulate the students to include our society's common values and let them be expressed in practical everyday action in different contexts.

So according to Lgr 11 you should not be passive but should take a stance and influence the students in these subjects to become part of the society. And if it has a great impact on them then they hopefully learn more as well. The Teacher mentioned that 1,5 year later when the students finished school and looked back on their time in school, the edularp was one of the things that came up. It was then more on a relationship level than about the subject. That seems to be something the Designer/producer is aware of since ze says that it is important to think about this as part of your design and before you run the larp.

As seen in the Theory part there were four main areas that has been mentioned in previous literature. Problems with playing a character, Learning facts, Fun but not educational, and the Problems with not preparing or doing proper debrief. We can see both Problems with playing a character and Learning facts mentioned by the participants. We can also see real effects of Problems with not preparing or doing proper debrief. We see it mentioned indirectly as something that could be a problem when the Teacher talked about how the debrief help the students with separating themselves from their character but we can also see a more direct effect of this. The Recent participant seems to have learned something else than what was planned. The Recent participant played "For the greater good" as part of an education

about games and did not do the full debrief as usually done. “For the greater good” is a larp about what it means to be brave and about standing up for your rights but also about problematise how to do this in the best way in different situations. In the interview the Recent participant says:

The smartest thing for me to do, if this had been a real situation, had been to be quiet. And like, just agree.

One of the things the Recent participant took with hir was to keep your head down. In a larp about standing up for your rights this is not the intended learning. On the other hand, that it was the smartest thing to do does not mean that it was the right thing to do, or that it is what ze would have wanted to do or even what ze would have done. This is something that would have been talked about in a debrief and that was not done in this case. We can not know for certain that a full debrief would have changed the experience that the Recent participant had but we can see a difference compared to the others. It seems like not doing the debrief is to let go of the control of what the participants will take away with them. This is another example that adds to the findings of Aarebrot & Nielsen (2012) and McDonald & Kreizenbeck (2012). The last problematic area we can see in the Theory part is Fun but not educational. This is not mentioned by any of the participants in the interviews. It might be because they did not perceive it at all but since they mentioned things they think they learned it is probable that they did not perceive it as a problem.

The model

When applying Hammer et al’s (2018) model I got some of my preconceptions confirmed. It did help me in structuring the answers but it is also a very wide model. It is intended to cover many different parts of role-playing games and that shows. As a way of highlighting different areas it does a good job even if I found some areas where it could be supplemented after the parts have been researched more. The areas I would suggest to add is Agency to the educational feature Portraying a character and Personal growth to the educational feature Altered sense of reality. To analyse specific games the model is a bit too wide. Depending on what type of role-playing game you intend to look at there will always be a lot of parts that are not relevant. The same problem goes for using the model as a design tool. You can use it to get ideas and get inspired but it will not be usable as a checklist. The parts of the model that was relevant for this thesis did help in highlighting some of the areas that were mentioned a lot less by my participants. My conclusion about the model is that is a good place to start for analyses but it also a bit blunt.

Limitations

The fact that I work with edularps will influence my view of it as a tool for learning. If I thought it was useless and horrible I would not have devoted my life to it. Even if I can still be critical to what I do I realise I have a strong preconception about that it works. That everyone I interviewed knows I work with it and did play the larps with me as one of the organisers can also influence their answers. The fact that the study was very small and that I wanted to have many different perspectives on the subject means that more research should be done to ensure the results. Also three out of the four people I interview had a background in education. It would be interesting to see if the answers would be different if you had a wider spread when it comes to backgrounds. Even if I did have the survey as a start all the interviews were made with grown-ups and that might also influence the answers. What they perceive is connected to how they think about learning in general but also on a personal level. The more you have studied and the older you get the more you have probably thought about your learning process. This means that some areas might be harder to see if you are younger and should be highlighted clearer to certain age groups. This is not something we can see in this study so further research would be needed for that.

Conclusions

In the end there does not seem to be any clear differences in perceptions about learning from edularps no matter if you are a student, a teacher or a designer. What seems to affect most is more connected to how immersed you are in the larp than what relationship you have to it. There do seem to be a difference between what parts that were easy or hard to perceive. When applying Hammer et al's (2018) key features about learning through RPGs and edularps to the experience of participants we can see that some learning features in edularps are easier perceived than others. Things connected to portraying a character is most obvious while things connected to shared imaginations was not mentioned as much. This is the areas that needs be highlighted more when talking about edularps learning features to help show what it could be used for and what strengths it has. Looking at weaknesses the participants seem to highlight problems that we can see in other research. The two main things brought up is about playing a character and about bad design and implementations problems. Problems mentioned about playing a character is about difficulties with not just being yourself and differentiate between you and your character. Connected to this the importance of a proper debrief is brought up. The part about bad design and implementation problems is focused on using edularp in a way that singles out someone connected to things in real life like a bullying situation. This is not something we see mentioned in previous research and we do not if it is a real problem.

Reference list

- Aarebrot, E. Nielsen, M. (2012) Prisoner for a Day: Creating a Game Without Winners. In M. Eckhoff Andresen (Ed) *Playing the Learning Game: A Practical Introduction to Educational Roleplaying*, 24-29. Oslo, Norway: Fantasiforbundet
- Bowman, S, L. (2010). The functions of role-playing games: How participants create community, solve problems, and explore identity. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company, Inc
- Bowman, S, L. (2014). Educational Live Action Role-playing Games: A secondary Literature Review. In S. L. Bowman (Ed), *The Wyrd Con Companion Book 2014* (p.112-131). Los Angeles, CA: Wyrd Con
- Bowman, S, L. Standiford, A. (2015) Educational Larp in the Middle School Classroom: A Mixed Method Case Study. *International Journal of Role-playing*, 5(1)
- Brummel, B, J. Gunsalus, C, K. Andresen, K, L. Louie, C, M. (2010). Development of Role-play Scenarios for Teaching Responsible Conduct of Research. *Sci Eng Ethics*, 16, 573-589.
- Bruun, J. (2011) Prelarp Workshops as Learning Situations—Matching Intentions with Outcome, in T. Henriksen Duus, C. Bierlich, K. Friis Hansen, V. Kølle (Ed), *Think Larp: Academic Writings from KP2011*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Rollespilsakademiet
- Cheng, M. (2008) Student Perceptions of Interactive Drama Activities. *Journal of Interactive Drama*, 3(3), 1-26
- Cherif, Abour H. and Christine H. Somervill. (1995). Maximizing Learning: Using Role Playing in the Classroom. *The American Biology Teacher* 57(1), 28-33
- Guenther, F, J., Moore, L,L. (2005) Role Playing as a Leadership Development Tool, *Journal of Leadership Education*, 4(2), 59-65
- Hammer, J., To, A., Schrier, K., Bowman, S, L., Kaufman, G. (2018) Learning and Role-Playing Games. In J. P. Zagal, S. Deterding (Ed), *Role-Playing Game Studies: Transmedia foundations* (p. 283-299). New York: Routledge
- Harder, S. (2007). Confessions of a schoolteacher: Experienced with role-playing in education. In J. Donnis, L.Thorup, M. Gade (Ed.), *Lifelike* (pp. 229-236). Copenhagen, Denmark: Projektgruppen KP07
- Henriksen, T, D. (2006) Games and Creativity Learning. In T. Fritzon, T. Wrigstad (Ed.), *Role, Play, Art: Collected Experiences of Role-Playing*, 3-16. Stockholm: Föreningen Knutpunkt
- Heyward, P. (2010) Emotional Engagement Through Drama: Strategies to Assist Learning through Roleplay. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 22(2), 197-203.
- Howes, E. V., & Cruz, B. C. (2009). Role-playing in science education: An effective strategy for developing multiple perspectives. *Journal of Elementary Science Education*, 21(3), 33-46
- Hyltoft, M. (2010) Four reasons why edu-larp works. In: K. Dombrowski (Ed), *LARP: Einblicke*. (p 43-57) Braunschweig, Germany: Zauberfeder Ltd.
- Hyltoft, M. (2012) Full-Time Edu-larpers: Experiences from Østerskov. In M. Eckhoff Andresen (Ed.), *Playing the Learning Game: A Practical Introduction to Educational Roleplaying*, 20-23. Oslo, Norway: Fantasiforbundet

- Jansen, F, S. (2012) "Larp the Swedish Way: An Educational Space Odyssey." In M. Eckhoff Andresen (Ed.), *Playing the Learning Game: A Practical Introduction to Educational Roleplaying*, 30-35. Oslo, Norway: Fantasiforbundet
- Karalevich, A. (2012) *Experiences from 1943: Teaching History Through Larps*. In M. Eckhoff Andresen (Ed.), *Playing the Learning Game: A Practical Introduction to Educational Roleplaying*, 36-44. Oslo, Norway: Fantasiforbundet
- Kettula, K. (2012). *Towards professional growth: essays on learning and teaching forest economics and marketing through drama, role-play and reflective journals*. *Dissertationes Forestales* 152. 93 p. Available at <http://www.metla.fi/dissertationes/dfl152.htm>
- Lajvbyrån. (2018). Retrieved 2018-12-17 from <http://lajvbyran.se/>
- Martin, R. (2007) *Assessment of Task-Based Activities in University EFP Classes*. *Journal of Interactive Drama* 2(2), 8-21.
- McSharry, Gabrielle and Sam Jones. (2000) *Role-play in Science Teaching and Learning*. *School Science Review* 82(298), 73-82.
- Mochocki, M. (2013) *Edu-larp as revision of subjectmatter knowledge*. *The International Journal of RolePlaying* 4. 55-75.
- Mochocki, M. (2014). *Larping the Past: Research Report on High-School Edu-Larp*. In S.L. Bowman (Ed), *The Wyrd Con Companion Book 2014* (p.112-131). Los Angeles, CA: Wyrd Con
- Nordic Larp. (2018) Accessed 2018-12-26 from <https://nordiclarp.org/what-is-nordic-larp/>
- Porter, A. L. (2008) *Role-playing and religion: Using games to educate millennials*. *Teaching Theology and Religion* 11(4), 230-235.
- Skolverket. (2011). *Läroplan för grundskolan, förskoleklassen och fritidshemmet 2011*. Stockholm: Skolverket.
- Westborg, J. (2016). *Alfa Omega in Särkijärvi*, J. Lojonen, M. Kangas, K (Red), *Larp Realia - Analysis, Design and Discussions of Nordic Larp*. Ropecon ry

Appendix 1 – Survey questions

The questions asked in the survey was as followed with the answer possibilities within parentheses.

Grade the experience. (From 1 to 5 where 5 is great and 1 is bad)

Which words would you use to describe the larp? (Interesting, Fun, Different, Educational, Boring, Ok)

The morning's workshops made it easier for me to larp. (Yes, No)

Do you feel that you could influence what happened in the larp? (Yes, No)

My character did things I would not normally do. (Yes, No)

If you said yes, please share what they did. (Open answer)

Do you feel that you have grown on a personal level? (Yes, No)

If you said yes, please share in what way. (Open answer)

I have learned something today. (Yes, No)

Please write something about what you have learned. (Open answer)

Tell us about something you will remember (Open answer)

I want to larp again! (Yes, No)

Other comments. (Open answer)

Appendix 2 – Interview questions

A lot of the participants in the survey mentioned that their character did things they themselves wouldn't normally do. Is this something you did experience/see?

Is this something that has affected your life outside of the larp?

What are your thoughts about playing a character?

Does playing a character affect the agency for the participants?

If it does, is it something that stays in the edularp or is it something that can be brought out of the larp?
Have you experienced this yourself in anyway?

What are your thoughts about edularps as a method to change perspectives?

Have you thought about the subject of the larp after the larp? In relation to other things outside of the larp?

Is there some area where you see that edularps wouldn't be good to use or any problems with the method?